



Project HORIZONTAL Validation Report on loss on ignition

Validation of a horizontal standard for the determination of loss on ignition (LOI)
in soils, sludges and treated biowaste
in a European Intercomparison Exercise

E. Sobiecka, H. van der Sloot, K. Andersen, B. M. Gawlik



EUR 23011 EN - 2007

The mission of the Institute for Environment and Sustainability is to provide scientific-technical support to the European Union's Policies for the protection and sustainable development of the European and global environment.

European Commission
Joint Research Centre
Institute for Environment and Sustainability

Contact information

Address: Via Enrico Fermi 2749, 21027 Ispra (VA), Italy
E-mail: bernd.gawlik@jrc.it
Tel.: +39 0332 789487
Fax: +39 0332 789158

<http://ies.jrc.ec.europa.eu>
<http://www.jrc.ec.europa.eu>

Legal Notice

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of this publication.

A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet.

It can be accessed through the Europa server
<http://europa.eu/>

JRC 40200

EUR 23011 EN
ISBN 978-92-79-07411-0
ISSN 1018-5593
DOI 10.2788/47824

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

© European Communities, 2007

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged

Printed in Luxembourg

Project HORIZONTAL Validation Report

Validation of a horizontal standard for the determination of loss on ignition (LOI) in soils, sludge and treated biowaste in a European Intercomparison Exercise

E. Sobiecka, H. Van der Sloot, K. Andersen, B. M. Gawlik[✉]

Elzbieta Sobiecka, Bernd Manfred Gawlik

*European Commission, Joint Research Centre
Institute for Environment and Sustainability
Via Enrico Fermi
21020 Ispra - Italy*

Hans van der Sloot

*ECN
Emission Characterisation and Reduction
Westerduinweg 3, P.O. Box 1
1755 ZG Petten
The Netherlands*

Kirsten ANDERSEN

*DANAK
Dyregårdsvej 5 B
2740 Skovlunde
Denmark*

[✉] to whom correspondence should be sent
by email to bernd.gawlik@jrc.it

Summary

Project HORIZONTAL is interdisciplinary aiming at a harmonisation and horizontal standardisation of test procedures, in particular for sludge, soil and biowaste. In the context of this standardization project, a series of draft technical specifications were designed upon an extensive desk study, fine-tuned after expert consultations and finally validated in international intercomparison exercise.

This report summarises the work performed in a validation study for the draft standard for the determination of loss on ignition (LOI) in soil, sludge and treated bio-waste. It further explains the underlying statistical concept for the calculation of reproducibility and repeatability from intercomparison data. In addition all single values, results of the statistical evaluation as well as background information on the validation materials used are described and explained.

Abbreviations

Throughout this report the following abbreviations are used:

ANOVA	Analysis of variances	LOI	Loss on Ignition
CAS	Chemical Abstracts System	JRC	Joint Research Centre
CEN	Comité Européen de Normalisation	MILC	Measure Interlaboratory Comparison
DG	Directorate General	p	Number of labs
ECN	Energy Research Centre for the Netherlands	r	Repeatability limit
EU	European Union	R	Reproducibility limit
IES	Institute for Environment and Sustainability	s _r	Repeatability standard deviation
IT	Information Technology	s _R	Reproducibility standard deviation
ISO	International Organization for Standardisation	TC	Technical Committee

Table of Contents

Summary.....	2
Abbreviations	3
Table of Contents	4
Introduction to the validation project	5
1.1 Statistical concept underlying the validation.....	6
1.1.1 Introduction to the statistical model	6
1.1.2 Requirements for precision experiment.....	7
1.1.3 Statistical analysis	8
1.2 Validation exercise for loss on ignition.....	8
1.2.1 Samples dispatched for the validation of loss on ignition	8
1.2.2 Draft standards to be followed	8
1.2.3 Analytical program	8
1.2.4 Timing and Submission of data.....	9
1.2.5 Participants	10
1.3 Summary results and derived performance characteristics	10
1.4 Annexes	13

Introduction to the validation project

Project HORIZONTAL is interdisciplinary aiming at a harmonisation and horizontal standardisation of test procedures, in particular for sludge, soils and biowastes. It was created as in response to the European Commission Mandate M 330 given to CEN, asking for the development and validation of those standards in support of forthcoming EU Directives, such as:

- The revision of the Sewage Sludge Directive 86/278/EEC.
- The Directive on the biological treatment of biodegradable waste.
- The initiative on a legal framework for soil monitoring in Europe.

This mandate explicitly considers standards for the entire analytical procedure (i.e., sampling, pre-treatment and analytical measurement methods for inorganic, organic, hygiene and biological parameters). These are grouped into classes according to their physical/chemical properties, which in turn determine the methods needed to quantify the potential impact on human and animal health, plant uptake, soil function and groundwater quality. As the materials generally feature a mixture of different types of contaminants, it is important to provide an integrated answer covering evaluation of all relevant pollutants.

In order to fulfil the requirements of the aforementioned mandate, the European Commissions Joint Research Centre (JRC) and its Directorate-General for Environment (DG ENV) together with the Technical Committees of the European Standardisation Committee (CEN TCs) concerned designed a pre-normative research initiative called Project HORIZONTAL and presented it to the Commission and the Environmental Authorities in the Member States.

After an extensive literature research and careful evaluation of the feasibility of a given horizontal standard, the standards were drafted and finally validated in a European laboratory intercomparison.

The underlying statistical concept, information about the materials used, details about the participants, measurement results obtained as well as the derived performance characteristics obtained for the determination of loss on ignition (LOI) are described hereafter.

1.1 Statistical concept underlying the validation

According to the requirements of the work package concerning data handling and interpretation of the project HORIZONTAL the respective validation intercomparisons should be evaluated according to ISO 5725-2:1994. In particular repeatability and reproducibility of the draft standard should be determined. In the following, the approach chosen is explained.

1.1.1 Introduction to the statistical model

The statistical model used in ISO 5725 for estimation of accuracy of a measurement method assumes that every test result is the sum of three components:

$$y = m + B + e$$

y : test result

m : general mean

B : laboratory component of bias under repeatability conditions

e : random error occurring in every measurement under repeatability conditions

In the workprogram the quantification of term e is explicitly asked for (i.e. repeatability and reproducibility). The repeatability variance is measured directly as the variance of the error term e , but the reproducibility depends on the sum of the repeatability variance and the between-laboratory variance:

$$\sigma_r = \sqrt{\text{var}(e)}$$

$$\sigma_R = \sqrt{\sigma_L^2 + \sigma_r^2} \quad \text{with} \quad \sigma_L = \sqrt{\text{var}(B)}$$

However, soil, biowaste and sludge are multi-phase materials, i.e. they contain two or more distinct types of particles which are fundamentally different in their properties and composition. As a consequence, this introduces an important source of variation for the intercomparison exercise which needs to be considered, i.e. the inherent heterogeneity of the materials.

Thus, a contribution of variation between samples H is introduced to the general statistical model:

$$y = m + B + e + H$$

Using ANOVA techniques the different variances are calculated and separated for the evaluation.

1.1.2 Requirements for precision experiment

Layout of the experiment

A suite of 10 to 12 different materials (soil, sludge and biowaste) has been made available for the intercomparison exercises. For each parameter investigated, at least 10 laboratories should be nominated to participate. The same laboratories should analyse different parameters as far as possible. Due to the complexity of analysis and the respective workload of the laboratories, it was decided to propose six materials for the validation of the draft standard for determination of loss on ignition.

Each laboratory received two bottles of each material and was requested to perform 6 independent analyses per material¹ (3 per bottle) using the draft standard method. The 6 analyses per material should be carried out under repeatability conditions (i.e. same operator², same equipment, within a short period of time). As far as possible, also the different materials should be measured under repeatability conditions; however, changes of e.g. operator or equipment was permitted, but had to be reported. Likewise, the different materials could be analysed on different days, if necessary.

Equipment used in the experiment needed to be checked prior to the experiment according to the requirements of the draft standard. The results of these checks had to be documented. Similarly, date and time of each measurement had to be recorded for verification of repeatability conditions.

An appropriate timeframe for the entire exercise was set and should be respected.

Recruitment of the laboratories

Each sub-workpackage leader of HORIZONTAL was asked to select the laboratories using the information from section 5.2 of ISO 5725-2:1994. The draft standard was made available to the laboratories on the Project Horizontal homepage. Each laboratory was requested to provide the signed statements on cooperation as given in Annex 1.

Preparation and use of the materials

Materials used for the exercise were prepared according to the general requirements for reference materials as laid down in ISO Guide 34. Materials were accompanied by instructions for use.

Reporting of results

Online submissions of results using an internet-based IT platform as well as XLS-Spreadsheets were used. In case of online data submission, the participating laboratories received a unique and confidential login and password in due time, enabling them to enter their data in a structured form. For authentication purposes a signed printout had to be submitted by mail.

¹ Independent analysis means analysis of independent test portions, applying the entire analytical scheme to this test portion, from e.g. extraction to quantification. For instance it does not mean replicate injections of aliquots into a GC-MS instrument.

² Operator in this context may also consist of a fixed team of persons, e.g. one person performing extraction, one clean-up, one quantification.

The online data submission included a detailed questionnaire for additional information on the measurements.

1.1.3 Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis of data followed the requirements of ISO 5725-2:1994 and ISO 5725-5:1998. Appropriate tests for the homogeneity of variance, detection of outliers and normal distribution were applied. Statistical evaluation was done using an Excel Macro, developed, tested and successfully applied in other occasion by ECN. Evaluation was executed jointly by JRC and ECN.

1.2 Validation exercise for loss on ignition

1.2.1 Samples dispatched for the validation of loss on ignition

After a preliminary rough screening, the following materials were used for the validation round of LOI:

- Compost 1 A compost material from Vienna
- Compost 2 A compost material from Germany
- Sewage Sludge 1 A mixed sewage sludge from Essen, Germany
- Sewage Sludge 2 A mixed municipal sludge from North Rhine Westphalia, Germany
- Soil 4 A sludge amended soil from Hohenheim, Germany
- Soil 5 An agricultural soil from Reading, UK

A more detailed description of background concentrations can be found in Annex 2 to this report. The samples were dispatched simultaneously to all participants using a private courier service.

1.2.2 Draft standards to be followed

The draft standards to be followed could be downloaded following this link, which is situated on the website of the Project HORIZONTAL:

http://www.ecn.nl/docs/society/horizontal/LOI_Standard_for_validation.pdf

1.2.3 Analytical program

Two bottles had to be analysed for each of the six materials and each bottle had to be analysed independently three times. As mentioned above analyses were to be done under repeatability conditions. Results were to be reported referring to dry matter content. The choice, how to apply dry matter correction was free for each participant.

1.2.4 Timing and Submission of data

Dispatch of samples was done on the 18th of October 2006. For users of the Online data submission system (MILC), user registration was possible from 14th of November 2006 with opening of the MILC Data Submission on 1st of December 2006. The deadline for submission of results has been set for LOI to the 31st of January 2007.

Alternatively the participants were allowed to submit data electronically as Excel sheet using Email.

All data were treated in a confidential way. Any presentation hereafter refers only to numerical data and it will not be possible to identify the originating laboratory. Lab codes displayed are NOT related to the order of laboratories hereafter.

In addition to the information provided a Helpdesk was implemented in order to give quick and individual response to the participants during and immediately after the validation study. In case of doubt and suspected transcription errors, further enquires were conducted by JRC.

1.2.5 Participants

The following table lists the participating organizations and entities in the validation exercise for the horizontal LOI standard;

- Austria
 - Amt der Salzburger Landesregierung
 - barbara - Engineering, Consulting, Research & Service GmbH
- Belgium
 - VITO
- Czech Republic
 - Central Institute for Supervising and Testing in Agriculture (UKZUZ)
- Finland
 - Finnish Food Safety Authority Evira
 - Consulting Engineers Paavo Ristola Ltd
 - VTT
- France
 - CEMAGREF - UR QELY
 - INERIS
 - SAS Laboratoire
- Germany
 - Biolab Umweltanalysen GmbH
 - Federal Institute for Geosciences and natural Resources – BGR
 - Fachhochschule Weihenstephan, Forschungsanstalt für Gartenbau
- Sweden
 - ALCONTROL AB
- The Netherlands
 - ALCONTROL BV,
 - Analytico Milieu B. V.

1.3 Summary results and derived performance characteristics

The result of the various statistical evaluation according to ISO 5725-2 including outlier tests, calculation of repeatability and reproducibility standard deviations can be found in Annex 3. In addition, all data submitted by the participants as well as those considered for the calculation of the performance characteristics are listed in Annex 3.

The calculated average values, the repeatability standard deviation (s_r) and the reproducibility standard deviation (s_R) are given in Table 1.

The repeatability is determined as an interval around a measurement result (i.e. "repeatability limit"). This interval corresponds to the maximum difference that can be expected (with a 95% statistical confidence) between one test result and another, both test results being obtained under the following conditions: The tests are performed in accordance with the requirements of the present standard by the same laboratory using its own facilities and testing laboratory samples obtained from the same primary field

sample and prepared under identical procedures. The repeatability limit was calculated using the relationship: $r_{\text{test}} = f \cdot \sqrt{2} \cdot s_{r,\text{test}}$ with the critical range factor $f = 2$.

The reproducibility, like repeatability is also determined as an interval around a measurement result (i.e. "reproducibility limit"). This interval corresponds to the maximum difference that can be expected (with a 95% statistical confidence) between one test result and another test result obtained by another laboratory, both test results being obtained under the following conditions : The tests are performed in accordance with all the requirements of the present standard by two different laboratories using their own facilities and testing laboratory samples obtained from the same primary field sample and prepared under identical procedures. The reproducibility limit was calculated using the relationship: $R = f \cdot \sqrt{2} \cdot s_R$ with the critical range factor $f = 2$.

Table 1 - Results of the interlaboratory comparison studies of the determination of loss on ignition in treated biowaste, sludge and soil. All concentrations are expressed in % d.m.

Matrix	Parameter	Mean	sr	sR	r	R	p	Outliers	Total number of data	No of LOD
Sludge 1	LOI	53.4	1.3%	4.2%	1.9	6.3	12	3	93	0
Sludge 2	LOI	45.4	1.1%	1.6%	1.4	2.0	9	5	67	0
Compost 1	LOI	44.8	1.4%	1.9%	1.8	2.4	11	3	84	0
Compost 2	LOI	28.0	3.3%	6.5%	2.6	5.1	11	3	86	0
Soil 4	LOI	4.8	2.2%	5.5%	0.3	0.7	12	4	86	0
Soil 5	LOI	5.0	3.0%	4.4%	0.4	0.6	11	4	81	0

Abbreviations: sr Repeatability standard deviation; SR Reproducibility standard deviation; r Repeatability limit (comparing two measurements); R Reproducibility limit (comparing two measurements); p Number of labs.

1.4 Annexes

Annex 1: Model questionnaire to be filled by the participating laboratories

Annex 2: Report on the validation materials used

Annex 3: Statistical calculations

Annex 4: Data submitted

Annex 1:

Model questionnaire to be filled by the participating laboratories

Model questionnaire to be filled by the participating laboratories

Name of laboratory:
Contact person:
Contact details: email:
Phone:
Fax:
Mail address of lab:

Dispatch address of lab for shipment of samples (no PO boxes!):

Title of measurement method (copy attached):

Our laboratory is willing to participate in the precision experiment for this draft standard method.

Yes ☐

No ☐

As participant we understand that:

- All essential apparatus, chemicals and other requirements specified in the method must be available in our laboratory when the programme begins
- Specified timing requirements such as starting and finishing date of the programme must be rigidly met
- The method must be strictly adhered to
- Samples must be handled in accordance with instructions
- A qualified operator must perform the measurements

Having studied the method and having made a fair appraisal of our capabilities and facilities, we feel that we will be adequately prepared for cooperative testing of this method.

Comments:

.....
Signature Date

Annex 2:

Report on the validation materials used

Abstract

This report gives an overview on the available analytical information on the following raw materials to be used for the production of validation materials of the so-called Project HORIZONTAL:

- Four sludge materials from Düsseldorf, Germany,
- An agricultural soil material from Reading, United Kingdom;
- A compost material from Vienna, Austria;
- A compost material from Korschenbroich, Germany;
- A sludge-amended, agricultural soil from Pavia Province, Italy;
- A sludge-amended soil from Barcelona, Spain
- A sludge-amended soil from Essen, Germany
- A long-term sludge exposed soil from Hohenheim, Germany

List of Abbreviations

Throughout this report the following abbreviations are used.

AOX	absorbable organic halogens	LoD	limit of detection
C _{org}	organic carbon content	LUA	Landesumweltamt
C _{total}	total carbon content	N _{total}	total nitrogen content
CAT	cation exchangeable	NH ₄ -N	Ammonium nitrogen
CDD	chlorinated dibenzodioxin	NO ₃ -N	Nitrate nitrogen
CDF	chlorinated dibenzofuran	NP	nonylphenol
DEHP	di(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	NRW	North Rhine Westphalia
DM	dry matter	O	octa
EPA	Environment Protection Agency	P	poly
EU	European Union	PAH	polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
FM	fresh matter	PCB	polychlorinated biphenyl
Hp	hepta	Pe	penta
Hx	hexa	T	tetra
IES	Institute for Environment and Sustainability	TEQ	toxicity equivalent
IRMM	Institute for Reference Materials and Measurements	UBA	Umweltbundesamt
JRC	Joint Research Centre	WHO	World Health Organization
LAS	linear alkylsulfonates	WWTP	waste water treatment plant

1 Introduction

This report gives an overview on the available analytical information on the following raw materials to be used for the production of validation materials of the so-called Project HORIZONTAL:

- Four sludge materials from Düsseldorf, Germany,
- An agricultural soil material from Reading, United Kingdom;
- A compost material from Vienna, Austria;
- A compost material from Korschenbroich, Germany;
- A sludge-amended, agricultural soil from Pavia Province, Italy;
- A sludge-amended soil from Barcelona, Spain
- A sludge-amended soil from Essen, Germany
- A long-term sludge exposed soil from Hohenheim, Germany

The following analytical information was gathered partly before and during the sampling of the raw materials, to be used for the production of the HORIZONTAL validation materials. The material were sampled by IES and shipped to IRMM in the course of the year 2005. The information gathered was then completed by various analytical screenings for PAHs and PCBs done by the Institute for Reference Materials and Measurements, Geel, Belgium, for phthalates done by UBA, Berlin, Germany, for PBDE done by IIQAB-CSIC, Barcelona, Spain, for trace elements and some selected major and minor elements by the Institute for Environment and Sustainability, Ispra, Italy.

The work compiled hereafter is based on the numerous additional efforts of the scientists working at various members of the consortium Project HORIZONTAL-Org and contributing organisations.

This work is gratefully acknowledged.

2 Overview on property values

2.1 *Sludge materials from Düsseldorf, Germany*

The various sewage sludge materials originate from various installations in the North Rhine Westphalia and were produced and sampled by staff from the Landesumweltamt (LUA) NRW under the responsibility from Dr. K. Furtmann.

In total, four sludge materials (Sludge A and D from a major municipal WWTP, Sludge B from a municipal WWTP with industrial input, and Sludge C from a municipal WWTP with high PCB-Content,) were obtained and will be blended to two final materials. Before sampling the following analytical data for a typical sample were received.

Table 1 – Analytical data obtained on an average sludge sample in LUA NRW
(with courtesy of K. Furtmann, LUA, Düsseldorf)

<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Concentration</i>
PCB	120 ug/kg
DEHP	110 mg/kg
PAH	5 mg/kg (EPA)
PCDD/F	15 ng TE/kg
PBDE	400 ug/kg
NP	40 mg/kg
LAS	3 g/kg
AOX	300 mg/kg

Subsequent screening led to the information displayed hereafter. It should be stressed that the data were obtained as SCREENING information on the UNTREATED or partially treated raw materials. Therefore, the final target values, which are relevant for the validation intercomparison can be different.

Table 2 – Analytical data obtained on a first screening on the sludge samples from LUA NRW

	<i>Sewage sludge A Dusseldorf</i>	<i>sewage sludge D Dusseldorf</i>
PCB (ng/g)		
28	62	35
52	101	65
101	31	38
118	49	40
153	30	33
105	24	11
138	46	38
156	<1	<1
180	34	23
170	23	19
PAH (ng/g)		
Naphtalene	34	381
Acenaphthylene	15	43
Acenaphthene	81	108
Fluorene	94	1167
Phenantrene		3440
Anthracene	22	344
Flouranthene	316	4817
Pyrene	235	3011
Benz(a)anthracene	473	791
Chrysene	691	1078
Benz(b)fluoranthene	538	1688
Benz(k)fluoranthene	228	635
Benz(a)pyrene	383	1114
Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene	92	229
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	71	70
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	80	185

Table 3 – Data on phthalate contents (with courtesy of S. Heise, UBA, Germany)

	<i>DiBP</i>	<i>DBP</i>	<i>DCHP</i>	<i>DEHP</i>	<i>Water</i>
	µg/g dm	µg/g dm	µg/g dm	µg/g dm	Wgt. %
Sludge D (1)		0.135		41.474	3.85
Sludge B (2)	0.538	0.034		30.634	5.47
Sludge A (3)	0.184	0.037		31.399	1.46
Sludge C (4)		0.354	1.528	6.678	2.29

Table 4 – Data on PDBE contents (with courtesy of D. Barceló and co-workers, IIQAB-CSIC, Barcelona, Spain)

	<i>Sludge 2</i> (B)
Tetra-BDE-47	55.4
Penta-BDE-100	9.59
Penta-BDE-99	69.4
Hexa-BDE-154	5.91
Hexa-BDE-153	7.72
Hepta-BDE-183	5.09
Octa-BDE-196	nq
Octa-BDE-197	nq
Octa-BDE-203	9.70
Deca-BDE-209	2216
TOTAL	2379

Table 5 – Screening data on some selected trace elements by ICP-AES after micro-wave assisted digestion using aqua regia (with courtesy of F. Sena, IES, Ispra, Spain). Note that these data are based on single measurements!

	<i>Cd</i>	<i>Co</i>	<i>Cr</i>	<i>Cu</i>	<i>Mn</i>	<i>Ni</i>	<i>Pb</i>	<i>Sb</i>	<i>Tl</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>Zn</i>
	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g
Sludge 1 (D)	2.65	29.0	53.3	359	1231	33.8	78.4	4.38	< 0.05	23.2	786
Sludge 2 (B)	1.19	31.1	62.6	202	278	29.9	72.2	2.51	< 0.05	11.8	625
Sludge 3 (A)	1.68	36.0	62.1	332	847	41.6	119	4.51	< 0.05	11.6	1237
Sludge 4 (C)	5.63	19.8	116	273	726	51.1	473	6.18	< 0.05	44.4	2015

Table 6 – Screening data on some selected matrix constituents and elements by WDXRF (with courtesy of S. Vaccaro).

<i>Sample</i>	<i>SiO2 (%)</i>	<i>Al2O3 (%)</i>	<i>CaO (%)</i>	<i>K2O (%)</i>	<i>Fe2O3 (%)</i>	<i>MgO (%)</i>	<i>TiO2 (PPM)</i>	<i>S (PPM)</i>	<i>P2O5 (PPM)</i>
Sludge 1 (D)	21.54	5.8	8.44	0.99	10.3	1.01	4367	<15	50448
Sludge 2 (B)	10.67	3.66	6.92	0.46	14.91	0.77	5217	<15	57633
Sludge 3 (A)	7.31	6.63	6.84	0.35	12.87	0.68	3733	<15	60369
Sludge 4 (C)	43.79	9.65	5.27	1.63	5.22	1.07	5628	<15	23945

<i>Sample</i>	<i>Na2O (%)</i>	<i>Cl (PPM)</i>	<i>Pb (PPM)</i>	<i>Zn (PPM)</i>	<i>Cu (PPM)</i>	<i>Ni (PPM)</i>	<i>Mn (PPM)</i>	<i>Cr (PPM)</i>
Sludge 1 (D)	0.3	2403	101	1002	350	15	1944	132
Sludge 2 (B)	0.31	315	97	879	172	12	514	180
Sludge 3 (A)	0.31	1281	153	1567	265	16	1440	168
Sludge 4 (C)	0.55	231	628	2625	371	81	1101	244

2.2 Agricultural soil material from Reading, United Kingdom

The material was proposed by the University of Reading (S. Nortcliff) and was sampled from a site called “*Frogmore Farm*” which was featured in the “*Metals*” Report for HORIZONTAL. This site is close to Reading with soils developed on flintyloamy periglacial materials over Chalk, has a long and well documented history of sludge application. The focus of the work of Nortcliff *et al.* undertook at this site and the monitoring and control at the site (by Thames Water and the subsequent subsidiary bodies dealing with sludge application to soil) was on metals (and metal loads), with no analysis or indeed any form of investigation in to organics in the broadest sense.

The analytical information produced in the context of the screening of the raw material is displayed below.

Table 7 – Data on phthalate contents (with courtesy of S. Heise, UBA, Germany)

	<i>DiBP</i>	<i>DBP</i>	<i>DCHP</i>	<i>DEHP</i>	<i>Water</i>
	µg/g dm	µg/g dm	µg/g dm	µg/g dm	Wgt. %
Soil 3 (Reading)		0.032		0.119	6.69

Table 8 – Screening data on some selected trace elements by ICP-AES after micro-wave assisted digestion using aqua regia (with courtesy of F. Sena). Note that these data are based on single measurements!

	<i>Cd</i>	<i>Co</i>	<i>Cr</i>	<i>Cu</i>	<i>Mn</i>	<i>Ni</i>	<i>Pb</i>	<i>Sb</i>	<i>Tl</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>Zn</i>
	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g
Soil 3 (Reading)	0.15	7.06	27.9	13.8	152	9.01	26.7	3.00	< 0.05	25.8	93.1

Table 9 – Analytical data obtained on a first screening on the sludge-amended soil from Reading (courtesy of IRMM)

<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Concentration</i>
PCB	ng/g
28	<1
52	<1
101	<1
118	<1
153	<1
105	<1
138	<1
156	<1
180	<1
170	<1
PAH	ng/g
Naphtalene	<10
Acenaphtylene	21
Acenaphthene	<10
Fluorene	<10
Phenantrene	<10
Anthracene	<10
Flouranthene	818
Pyrene	776
Benz(a)anthracene	565

<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Concentration</i>
Chrysene	608
Benz(b)fluoranthene	824
Benz(k)fluoranthene	329
Benz(a)pyrene	799
Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene	779
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	118
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	394

Table 10 – Data on PDBE contents (with courtesy of D. Barceló and co-workers, IIQAB-CSIC, Barcelona, Spain)

	<i>Soil 3 (Reading)</i>
Tetra-BDE-47	nq
Penta-BDE-100	nq
Penta-BDE-99	1.03
Hexa-BDE-154	0.03
Hexa-BDE-153	nq
Hepta-BDE-183	nq
Octa-BDE-196	nq
Octa-BDE-197	nd
Octa-BDE-203	nd
Deca-BDE-209	272
TOTAL	273

Table 11 – Screening data on some selected trace elements by ICP-AES after micro-wave assisted digestion using aqua regia (with courtesy of F. Sena). Note that these data are based on single measurements!

	<i>Cd</i>	<i>Co</i>	<i>Cr</i>	<i>Cu</i>	<i>Mn</i>	<i>Ni</i>	<i>Pb</i>	<i>Sb</i>	<i>Tl</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>Zn</i>
	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g
Soil 3 (Reading)	0.15	7.06	27.9	13.8	152	9.01	26.7	3.00	< 0.05	25.8	93.1

Table 12 – Screening data on some selected matrix constituents and elements by WDXRF (with courtesy of S. Vaccaro).

<i>Sample</i>	<i>SiO2 (%)</i>	<i>Al2O3 (%)</i>	<i>CaO (%)</i>	<i>K2O (%)</i>	<i>Fe2O3 (%)</i>	<i>MgO (%)</i>	<i>TiO2 (PPM)</i>	<i>S (PPM)</i>	<i>P2O5 (PPM)</i>
Soil 3 (Reading)	79.36	4.77	1.12	0.96	1.94	0.17	4107	443	2102

<i>Sample</i>	<i>Na2O (%)</i>	<i>Cl (PPM)</i>	<i>Pb (PPM)</i>	<i>Zn (PPM)</i>	<i>Cu (PPM)</i>	<i>Ni (PPM)</i>	<i>Mn (PPM)</i>	<i>Cr (PPM)</i>
Soil 3 (Reading)	0.42	13	45	69	69	69	216	92

Table 13 – Screening data on mercury by solid-sampling cold-vapour AAS using amalgamation enrichment (with courtesy of G. Locoro).

<i>Sample</i>	<i>Hg µg/g</i>
Soil 3 (Reading)	0.12

2.3 Compost from Vienna, Austria

The fresh compost material was obtained from the Austrian Federal Environment Agency (UBA, Vienna), which had used a sub-batch of the raw material for national intercomparison. The remainder of the material was stored at 4°C until shipment to IRMM for further processing. The following analytical information was provided by UBA Austria and completed with various screenings.

Table 14 – Analytical data on compost material received from UBA Austria
Inorganic and sum parameters

Parameter	Unit	Sample fraction used	Observed mean
B CAT	mg/l F.M.	Fresh sample, <10mm	6.1
K CAT	mg/l F.M.	Fresh sample, <10mm	2624
Mg CAT	mg/l F.M.	Fresh sample, <10mm	242
P CAT	mg/l F.M.	Fresh sample, <10mm	49
B CAT	% D.M.	Fresh sample, <10mm	0.0017
K CAT	% D.M.	Fresh sample, <10mm	0.72
Mg CAT	% D.M.	Fresh sample, <10mm	0.07
P CAT	% D.M.	Fresh sample, <10mm	0.01
NO ₃ -N	mg/kg F.M.	Fresh sample, <10mm	3.5
NH ₄ -N	mg/kg F.M.	Fresh sample, <10mm	230
Ctotal	% D.M.	<45° dry, milled	29
Corg	% D.M.	<45° dry, milled	27
Ntotal	% D.M.	<45° dry, milled	1.7
P	mg/kg D.M.	<45° dry, milled	2596
K	mg/kg D.M.	<45° dry, milled	11019
K	% D.M.	<45° dry, milled	1.10
B	mg/kg D.M.	<45° dry, milled	60
Cd	mg/kg D.M.	<45° dry, milled	0.46
Cr	mg/kg D.M.	<45° dry, milled	25
Cu	mg/kg D.M.	<45° dry, milled	46
Hg	mg/kg D.M.	<45° dry, milled	0.20
Ni	mg/kg D.M.	<45° dry, milled	18
Pb	mg/kg D.M.	<45° dry, milled	45
Zn	mg/kg D.M.	<45° dry, milled	198
Ca	mg/kg D.M.	<45° dry, milled	68776
Ca	% D.M.	<45° dry, milled	6.9
Mo	mg/kg D.M.	<45° dry, milled	0.8
S	mg/kg D.M.	<45° dry, milled	2137
Fe	mg/kg D.M.	<45° dry, milled	9959
Mn	mg/kg D.M.	<45° dry, milled	418
Na	mg/kg D.M.	<45° dry, milled	742
Co	mg/kg D.M.	<45° dry, milled	4.1
AOX	mg/kg D.M.	<30° dry, milled	62

Table 15 – Analytical data on compost material received from UBA Austria
Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons

PAH	Unit	Result
Naphthaline	µg/kg DM	9.3
Acenaphthylene	µg/kg DM	8.6
Acenaphthene	µg/kg DM	5
Fluorene	µg/kg DM	8.0
Phenanthrene	µg/kg DM	89
Anthracene	µg/kg DM	27
Fluoranthene	µg/kg DM	487
Pyrene	µg/kg DM	380

<i>PAH</i>	<i>Unit</i>	<i>Result</i>
Benzo(a)anthracene	µg/kg DM	278
Chrysene	µg/kg DM	317
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	µg/kg DM	365
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	µg/kg DM	193
Benz(a)pyrene	µg/kg DM	320
Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene	µg/kg DM	233
Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	µg/kg DM	67
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	µg/kg DM	225
Sum EPA	µg/kg DM	3013
Sum EPA	mg/kg DM	3.0

Table 16 – Analytical data on compost material received from UBA Austria
Sum PCDDs and PCBs

<i>Parameter</i>			
Dioxine	TEQ (ITEF)	ng/kg DM	7.3
PCB	TEQ (WHO)	ng/kg DM	3.5
	Σ Ballschmiter	mg/kg DM	0.05

Table 17 – Analytical data on compost material obtained by screening in IRMM

<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Result in ng/g</i>
PCB	
28	2
52	2
101	4
118	3
153	10
105	1
138	8
156	1
180	5
170	<1
PAH	
Naphtalene	<10
Acenaphthylene	<10
Acenaphthene	<10
Fluorene	<10
Phenanthrene	<10
Anthracene	26
Fluoranthene	611
Pyrene	510
Benzo(a)anthracene	888
Chrysene	957
Benzo(b)fluoranthene	1531
Benzo(k)fluoranthene	547
Benzo(a)pyrene	1101
Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene	416
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	81
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	295

Table 18 – Data on PDBE contents
(with courtesy of D. Barceló and co-workers, IIQAB-CSIC, Barcelona, Spain)

	Compost 1 (Vienna)
Tetra-BDE-47	4.02
Penta-BDE-100	0.19
Penta-BDE-99	2.59
Hexa-BDE-154	nq
Hexa-BDE-153	0.23
Hepta-BDE-183	0.04
Octa-BDE-196	nq
Octa-BDE-197	nq
Octa-BDE-203	1.44
Deca-BDE-209	17.4
TOTAL	25.9

Table 19 – Data on phthalate contents (with courtesy of S. Heise, UBA, Germany)

	DiBP	DBP	DCHP	DEHP	Water
	µg/g dm	µg/g dm	µg/g dm	µg/g dm	Wgt. %
Compost 1 (Vienna)		0.058		1.426	5.57

Table 20 – Screening data on some selected trace elements by ICP-AES after micro-wave assisted digestion using aqua regia (with courtesy of F. Sena). Note that these data are based on single measurements!

	Cd	Co	Cr	Cu	Mn	Ni	Pb	Sb	Tl	V	Zn
	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g
Compost 1 (Vienna)	0.39	7.36	31.9	41.0	365	12.7	49.5	0.04	0.79	0.13	208

Table 21 – Screening data on some selected matrix constituents and elements by WDXRF (with courtesy of S. Vaccaro).

Sample	SiO ₂ (%)	Al ₂ O ₃ (%)	CaO (%)	K ₂ O (%)	Fe ₂ O ₃ (%)	MgO (%)	TiO ₂ (PPM)	S (PPM)	P ₂ O ₅ (PPM)
Compost 1 (Vienna)	20.63	4.31	6.17	4.26	1.99	2.49	1602	<15	10521

Sample	Na ₂ O (%)	Cl (PPM)	Pb (PPM)	Zn (PPM)	Cu (PPM)	Ni (PPM)	Mn (PPM)	Cr (PPM)
Compost 1 (Vienna)	0.35	3496	81	375	79	55	653	60

Table 22 – Screening data on mercury by solid-sampling cold-vapour AAS using amalgamation enrichment (with courtesy of G. Locoro).

Sample	Hg µg/g
Compost 1 (Vienna)	0.17

2.4 Agricultural soil, sludge amended soil from Pavia, Italy

This sludge-amended soil material was obtained during a monitoring campaign, which aimed at a generic description of the over-all soil quality in Pavia Province, Italy. The material, which was collected from the upper horizon, originates from a small farm called “*Cascina Novello*”. During the characterisation of the site, the following analytical information was obtained on a pooled sample of a sub-area of the farm of 20 X 20 m².

Table 23 – Analytical data on Pavia soil

<i>Parameter</i>	<i>Result</i>
Al	7.13 Wgt%
As	22.4 mg/kg
Cd	0.79 mg/kg
Cr	59 mg/kg
Cu	30.8 mg/kg
Hg	0.08 mg/kg
Ni	34.4 mg/kg
Pb	24.6 mg/kg
Zn	95 mg/kg
C	0.91 Wgt %
2,3,7,8-TCDD	0.047 pg/g
1,2,3,7,8-PeCDD	0.15 pg/g
1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDD	0.19 pg/g
1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD	1.5 pg/g
1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDD	0.74 pg/g
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD	26 pg/g
OCDD	382 pg/g
2,3,7,8-TCDF	0.68 pg/g
1,2,3,7,8-PeCDF	0.53 pg/g
2,3,4,7,8-PeCDF	0.71 pg/g
1,2,3,4,7,8-HxDF	1.00 pg/g
1,2,3,6,7,8-HxDF	0.66 pg/g
2,3,4,6,7,8-HxDF	1.6 pg/g
1,2,3,7,8,9-HxDF	0.27 pg/g
1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpDF	12 pg/g
1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HpDF	0.68 pg/g
OCDF	33 pg/g
I-TEQ	2.0 pg/g
WHO-TEQ	1.7 pg/g

In addition, the screening performed at IRMM did not reveal significant quantities of PCBs and PAHs, which were all below the LoDs (1 ng/g for PCBs and 10 ng/g for PAHs, respectively).

Table 24 – Data on phthalate contents (with courtesy of S. Heise, UBA, Germany)

	<i>DiBP</i>	<i>DBP</i>	<i>DCHP</i>	<i>DEHP</i>	<i>Water</i>
	µg/g TM	µg/g TM	µg/g TM	µg/g TM	Wgt. %
Soil 5 (Pavia)		0.005		0.011	1.54

Table 25 – Data on PDBE contents (with courtesy of D. Barceló and co-workers, IIQAB-CSIC, Barcelona, Spain)

	Soil 5 (Pavia)
Tetra-BDE-47	nq
Penta-BDE-100	nq
Penta-BDE-99	0.39
Hexa-BDE-154	nq
Hexa-BDE-153	nq
Hepta-BDE-183	0.08
Octa-BDE-196	nq
Octa-BDE-197	nd
Octa-BDE-203	nd
Deca-BDE-209	670
TOTAL	671

Table 26 – Screening data on some selected trace elements by ICP-AES after micro-wave assisted digestion using aqua regia (with courtesy of F. Sena). Note that these data are based on single measurements!

	Cd	Co	Cr	Cu	Mn	Ni	Pb	Sb	Tl	V	Zn
	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g
Soil 5 (Pavia)	0.33	18.4	57.3	22.5	426	30.5	20.6	2.00	< 0.05	38.1	87.8

Table 27 – Screening data on some selected matrix constituents and elements by WDXRF (with courtesy of S. Vaccaro).

Sample	SiO ₂ (%)	Al ₂ O ₃ (%)	CaO (%)	K ₂ O (%)	Fe ₂ O ₃ (%)	MgO (%)	TiO ₂ (PPM)	S (PPM)	P ₂ O ₅ (PPM)
Soil 5 (Pavia)	69.39	12.9	1.45	2.24	4.25	1.16	6118	255	1789

Sample	Na ₂ O (%)	Cl (PPM)	Pb (PPM)	Zn (PPM)	Cu (PPM)	Ni (PPM)	Mn (PPM)	Cr (PPM)
Soil 5 (Pavia)	1.84	62	38	108	55	66	597	110

Table 28 – Screening data on mercury by solid-sampling cold-vapour AAS using amalgamation enrichment (with courtesy of G. Locoro).

Sample	Hg µg/g
Soil 5 (Pavia)	0.06

2.5 Sludge-amended-soil from Barcelona, Spain

The sludge-amended soil material from Barcelona sampled upon indication from the Barcelo'- Group in Barcelona.

Table 29 – Data on phthalate contents (with courtesy of S. Heise, UBA, Germany)

	<i>DiBP</i>	<i>DBP</i>	<i>DCHP</i>	<i>DEHP</i>	<i>Water</i>
	µg/g dm	µg/g dm	µg/g dm	µg/g dm	Wgt. %
Soil 2 (Lleida T.)		0.015		0.183	11.38

Table 30 – Data on PDBE contents (with courtesy of D. Barceló and co-workers, IIQAB-CSIC, Barcelona, Spain)

	<i>Soil 2</i> <i>(Lleida T.)</i>
Tetra-BDE-47	nq
Penta-BDE-100	nq
Penta-BDE-99	1.59
Hexa-BDE-154	0.45
Hexa-BDE-153	nq
Hepta-BDE-183	0.48
Octa-BDE-196	1.60
Octa-BDE-197	nq
Octa-BDE-203	nq
Deca-BDE-209	1000
TOTAL	1004

Table 31 – Screening data on some selected trace elements by ICP-AES after micro-wave assisted digestion using aqua regia (with courtesy of F. Sena). Note that these data are based on single measurements!

	<i>Cd</i>	<i>Co</i>	<i>Cr</i>	<i>Cu</i>	<i>Mn</i>	<i>Ni</i>	<i>Pb</i>	<i>Sb</i>	<i>Tl</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>Zn</i>
	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g
Soil 2 (Lleida T.)	0.59	14.1	32.7	53.6	405	18.6	18.4	2.24	< 0.05	31.8	111

Table 32 – Screening data on some selected matrix constituents and elements by WDXRF (with courtesy of S. Vaccaro).

<i>Sample</i>	<i>SiO2 (%)</i>	<i>Al2O3 (%)</i>	<i>CaO (%)</i>	<i>K2O (%)</i>	<i>Fe2O3 (%)</i>	<i>MgO (%)</i>	<i>TiO2 (PPM)</i>	<i>S (PPM)</i>	<i>P2O5 (PPM)</i>
Soil 2 (Lleida T.)	44.43	10.67	14.29	2.53	3.44	2.04	4116	780	3396

<i>Sample</i>	<i>Na2O (%)</i>	<i>Cl (PPM)</i>	<i>Pb (PPM)</i>	<i>Zn (PPM)</i>	<i>Cu (PPM)</i>	<i>Ni (PPM)</i>	<i>Mn (PPM)</i>	<i>Cr (PPM)</i>
Soil 2 (Lleida T.)	0.64	65	26	125	59	17	547	65

Table 33 – Screening data on mercury by solid-sampling cold-vapour AAS using amalgamation enrichment (with courtesy of G. Locoro).

<i>Sample</i>	<i>Hg µg/g</i>
Soil 2 (Lleida T.)	0.10

2.6 Sludge amended soil from Essen, Germany

The German sludge-amended soil from Essen, which was provided as the three sludge materials by LUA NRW, did not feature significant concentrations of the PCB congeners 28, 52, 101, 118, 153, 105, 138, 156, 180, 170, but had detectable amounts of some PAHs.

Table 34 – Analytical screening data on the German sludge-amended soil.

Parameter	Concentration (ng/g)
Naphtalene	<10
Acenaphtylene	<10
Acenaphthene	<10
Fluorene	<10
Phenantrene	<10
Anthracene	<10
Fluoranthene	28
Pyrene	20
Benz(a)anthracene	24
Chrysene	47
Benz(b)fluoranthene	76
Benz(k)fluoranthene	20
Benz(a)pyrene	35
Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene	35
Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	10
Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	26

Table 35 – Data on phthalate contents (with courtesy of S. Heise, UBA, Germany)

	DiBP	DBP	DCHP	DEHP	Water
	µg/g dm	µg/g dm	µg/g dm	µg/g dm	Wgt. %
Soil 4 (Essen)		0.011		0.302	0.55

Table 36 – Data on PDBE contents (with courtesy of D. Barceló and co-workers, IIQAB-CSIC, Barcelona, Spain)

	Soil 4 (Essen)
Tetra-BDE-47	nq
Penta-BDE-100	nq
Penta-BDE-99	nq
Hexa-BDE-154	nq
Hexa-BDE-153	nq
Hepta-BDE-183	nq
Octa-BDE-196	nq
Octa-BDE-197	nq
Octa-BDE-203	1.28
Deca-BDE-209	19.1
TOTAL	20.3

Table 37 – Screening data on some selected trace elements by ICP-AES after micro-wave assisted digestion using aqua regia (with courtesy of F. Sena). Note that these data are based on single measurements!

	<i>Cd</i>	<i>Co</i>	<i>Cr</i>	<i>Cu</i>	<i>Mn</i>	<i>Ni</i>	<i>Pb</i>	<i>Sb</i>	<i>Tl</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>Zn</i>
	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g
Soil 4 (Essen)	0.52	5.45	26.1	8.05	320	4.03	27.3	2.73	< 0.05	29.5	78.1

Table 38 – Screening data on some selected matrix constituents and elements by WDXRF (with courtesy of S. Vaccaro).

<i>Sample</i>	<i>SiO2 (%)</i>	<i>Al2O3 (%)</i>	<i>CaO (%)</i>	<i>K2O (%)</i>	<i>Fe2O3 (%)</i>	<i>MgO (%)</i>	<i>TiO2 (PPM)</i>	<i>S (PPM)</i>	<i>P2O5 (PPM)</i>
Soil 4 (Essen)	79.47	4.42	0.85	0.6	0.86	0.07	2163	189	2019

<i>Sample</i>	<i>Na2O (%)</i>	<i>Cl (PPM)</i>	<i>Pb (PPM)</i>	<i>Zn (PPM)</i>	<i>Cu (PPM)</i>	<i>Ni (PPM)</i>	<i>Mn (PPM)</i>	<i>Cr (PPM)</i>
Soil 4 (Essen)	0.45	19	42	87	683	60	462	61

Table 39 – Screening data on mercury by solid-sampling cold-vapour AAS using amalgamation enrichment (with courtesy of G. Locoro).

<i>Sample</i>	<i>Hg µg/g</i>
Soil 4 (Essen)	0.04

2.7 Long-term sludge exposed soil from Hohenheim-Stuttgart, Germany

Similarly, an additional sludge exposed soil was sampled at the University of Hohenheim, Stuttgart, where a test soil was long-term exposed to elevated concentrations of sewage sludge.

Table 40 – Data on phthalate contents (with courtesy of S. Heise, UBA, Germany)

	<i>DiBP</i>	<i>DBP</i>	<i>DCHP</i>	<i>DEHP</i>	<i>Water</i>
	µg/g TM	µg/g TM	µg/g TM	µg/g TM	Wgt. %
Soil 1 (Stuttgart)		0.045		0.263	17.65

Table 41 – Data on PDBE contents (with courtesy of D. Barceló and co-workers, IIQAB-CSIC, Barcelona, Spain)

	<i>Soil 1</i> (Stuttgart)
Tetra-BDE-47	nq
Penta-BDE-100	nq
Penta-BDE-99	2.30
Hexa-BDE-154	0.06
Hexa-BDE-153	0.04
Hepta-BDE-183	0.04
Octa-BDE-196	nq
Octa-BDE-197	nd
Octa-BDE-203	nd
Deca-BDE-209	498
TOTAL	500

Table 42 – Screening data on some selected trace elements by ICP-AES after micro-wave assisted digestion using aqua regia (with courtesy of F. Sena). Note that these data are based on single measurements!

	<i>Cd</i>	<i>Co</i>	<i>Cr</i>	<i>Cu</i>	<i>Mn</i>	<i>Ni</i>	<i>Pb</i>	<i>Sb</i>	<i>Tl</i>	<i>V</i>	<i>Zn</i>
	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g	µg/g
Soil 1 (Stuttgart)	0.69	12.7	36.1	26.2	504	18.3	25.2	2.62	< 0.05	26.6	142

Table 43 – Screening data on some selected matrix constituents and elements by WDXRF (with courtesy of S. Vaccaro).

<i>Sample</i>	<i>SiO2 (%)</i>	<i>Al2O3 (%)</i>	<i>CaO (%)</i>	<i>K2O (%)</i>	<i>Fe2O3 (%)</i>	<i>MgO (%)</i>	<i>TiO2 (PPM)</i>	<i>S (PPM)</i>	<i>P2O5 (PPM)</i>
Soil 1 (Stuttgart)	71.94	10.06	1.33	1.86	3.66	0.88	7874	275	3571


<i>Sample</i>	<i>Na2O (%)</i>	<i>Cl (PPM)</i>	<i>Pb (PPM)</i>	<i>Zn (PPM)</i>	<i>Cu (PPM)</i>	<i>Ni (PPM)</i>	<i>Mn (PPM)</i>	<i>Cr (PPM)</i>
Soil 1 (Stuttgart)	1.23	50	47	212	85	69	991	129

Table 44 – Screening data on mercury by solid-sampling cold-vapour AAS using amalgamation enrichment (with courtesy of G. Locoro).

<i>Sample</i>	<i>Hg µg/g</i>
Soil 1 (Stuttgart)	1.77

Annex 3:
Statistical calculations

Sample: Compost 1
Element: LOI



Unit: mg/kg

Mandel's k statistics (Compost 1 - LOI)
Mandel's h statistics (Compost 1 - LOI)
Compost 1 - LOI -- Mean PARM = 44.83 [mg/kg]

General calc.parm.
T1= 3.76249E+03
T2= 1.68554E+05
T3= 84
T4= 758
T5= 3.0451E+01
n= variabel
p= 11
N-table= 7


Mandel's statistics															
LAB	PARM-gem	Stdev	N	h-mark	h	k	k-mark 1vX > AvST+2std	AvX < AvST-2std	PARM	Stdev	Rej.labs	N	N-1	dev_mean	
34L	40.2675	2.008	6	I	-1.86	1.88	!!		44.0091	0.9638	34L	11	10	-4.56	
43L	44.0091	0.964	11		-0.41	0.90		Fail	44.2333	0.2733		6	5	-0.60	
31L	44.2333	0.273	6		-0.32	0.26			44.4083	0.1881		12	11	-0.42	
40L	44.4083	0.188	12		-0.25	0.18			44.5167	1.2719		6	5	-0.31	
45L	44.5167	1.272	6		-0.21	1.19			44.5669	0.5586		6	5	-0.26	
4L	44.5669	0.559	6		-0.19	0.52									
65L	44.6500	2.334	8		-0.16	2.18	!!				65L			-0.18	
26L	44.7767	0.509	12		-0.11	0.48			44.7767	0.5094		12	11	-0.05	
30L	45.0750	0.967	4		0.01	0.90			45.0750	0.9674		4	3	0.24	
1L	45.2333	0.351	3		0.07	0.33			45.2333	0.3512		3	2	0.40	
23L	45.2500	0.745	6		0.07	0.70			45.2500	0.7450		6	5	0.42	
7L	45.3283	0.347	6		0.11	0.32			45.3283	0.3467		6	5	0.50	
55L	45.7333	0.365	12		0.26	0.34			45.7333	0.3651		12	11	0.90	
44L	52.7602	1.207	6	II	3.00	1.13	Fail				44L			7.93	
Tot.gem	45.058	0.864 mg/kg		1%-level:	2.30	(1.63)			11	44.8301	(34L,44L,65L)	11	10		
Tot.std=	2.570	0.656		5%-level:	1.85	(1.43)			3						

104



RESULTS: Mean = 44.83009 mg/kg

Repeatability variance S2r = 0.41714
Repeatability std. Sr = 0.64586 --> 1.44% r = 1.8084
Between lab variance S2L = 0.28668
Reproducibility var. S2R = 0.70382
Reproducibility std. SR = 0.83894 --> 1.87% R = 2.3490

Remarks: 3 Labs rejected! (34L,44L,65L)



Sample: Compost 2
Element: LOI



Unit: mg/kg

Mandel's k statistics (Compost 2 - LOI)
Mandel's h statistics (Compost 2 - LOI)
Compost 2 - LOI -- Mean PARM = 27.98 [mg/kg]

General calc.parm.
T1= 2.38516E+03
T2= 6.63458E+04
T3= 86
T4= 790
T5= 6.4108E+01
n= variabel
p= 11
N-table= 8


LAB	PARM-gem	Stdev	N	h-mark	Mandel's statistics		k-mark	k-mark 1vX > AvST+2std	AvX < AvST-2std	End Result:		Rej.labs	N	N-1	dev_mean
					h	k				PARM	Stdev				
40L	25.0417	0.151	12		-1.26	0.13				25.0417	0.1505		12	11	-2.94
43L	26.0750	0.755	12		-0.93	0.65			Fail	26.0750	0.7545		12	11	-1.90
34L	26.8095	0.975	6		-0.70	0.84			Fail	26.8095	0.9751		6	5	-1.17
19L	27.4733	2.088	6		-0.50	1.81	!!		Fail	-	-	19L	-	-	-0.50
23L	28.0400	1.021	5		-0.32	0.88			Fail	28.0400	1.0213		5	4	0.06
1L	28.3333	1.607	3		-0.23	1.39			Fail	28.3333	1.6073		3	2	0.36
45L	28.3833	1.125	6		-0.21	0.97				28.3833	1.1250		6	5	0.41
26L	28.5292	0.934	12		-0.17	0.81				28.5292	0.9340		12	11	0.55
31L	28.8000	1.018	6		-0.08	0.88				28.8000	1.0178		6	5	0.82
55L	28.9667	1.140	12		-0.03	0.99				28.9667	1.1404		12	11	0.99
4L	29.2214	0.983	6		0.05	0.85				29.2214	0.9832		6	5	1.24
7L	29.5533	0.807	6		0.16	0.70				29.5533	0.8073		6	5	1.58
65L	33.9488	0.939	8		1.53	0.81		Fail		-	-	65L	-	-	5.97
44L	37.6093	1.465	6	!!	2.68	1.27		Fail		-	-	44L	-	-	9.63
Tot.gem	29.056	1.072 mg/kg			2.30	(1.58)			11	27.9776	(19L,44L,65L)		11	10	
Tot.std=	3.190	0.444			1.85	(1.4)			3						

106



RESULTS: Mean = 27.97758 mg/kg

Repeatability variance S2r = 0.85477
Repeatability std. Sr = 0.92454 --> 3.30% r = 2.5887
Between lab variance S2L = 2.42716
Reproducibility var. S2R = 3.28193
Reproducibility std. SR = 1.81161 --> 6.48% R = 5.0725

Remarks: 3 Labs rejected! (19L,44L,65L)



Sample: Sludge 1
Element: LOI



Unit: mg/kg

Mandel's k statistics (Sludge 1 - LOI)
Mandel's h statistics (Sludge 1 - LOI)
Sludge 1 - LOI -- Mean PARM = 53.37 [mg/kg]

General calc.parm.
T1= 4.96407E+03
T2= 2.65359E+05
T3= 93
T4= 831
T5= 3.6029E+01
n= variabel
p= 12
N-table= 7


Mandel's statistics														End Result:				
LAB	PARM-gem	Stdev	N	h-mark	h	k	k-mark 1vX > AvST+2std	AvX < AvST-2std	PARM	Stdev	Rej.labs	N	N-1	dev_mean				
13L	40.2450	0.035	2	II	-3.02	0.02		Fail	-	13L	-	-	-	-13.13				
34L	48.0248	1.121	6		-1.07	0.49		Fail	48.0248	1.1205		6	5	-5.35				
23L	51.8000	7.778	2		-0.13	3.38	II		-	23L	-	-	-	-1.57				
65L	51.8913	1.646	8		-0.10	0.71			51.8913	1.6464		8	7	-1.48				
19L	52.1209	3.675	6		-0.05	1.60	I		-	19L	-	-	-	-1.25				
31L	52.7600	0.152	5		0.11	0.07			52.7600	0.1517		5	4	-0.61				
40L	53.0000	0.128	12		0.17	0.06			53.0000	0.1279		12	11	-0.37				
4L	53.3441	0.081	6		0.26	0.04			53.3441	0.0812		6	5	-0.03				
26L	53.4183	0.402	12		0.28	0.17			53.4183	0.4021		12	11	0.05				
7L	53.4333	0.175	6		0.28	0.08			53.4333	0.1748		6	5	0.06				
45L	53.7000	0.438	6		0.35	0.19			53.7000	0.4382		6	5	0.33				
43L	53.7273	0.546	11		0.36	0.24			53.7273	0.5461		11	10	0.36				
1L	54.0000	0.200	3		0.42	0.09			54.0000	0.2000		3	2	0.63				
55L	54.2000	0.121	12		0.47	0.05			54.2000	0.1206		12	11	0.83				
44L	58.9514	0.934	6		1.66	0.41	Fail		58.9514	0.9335		6	5	5.58				
Tot.gem		52.308			1% level:	2.32			12			12						
Tot.std=		3.992			5% level:	1.86			3			3						
										(13L,19L,23L)		12	11					

103



RESULTS: Mean = 53.37088 mg/kg

Repeatability variance S2r = 0.44480
Repeatability std. Sr = 0.66694 --> 1.25% r = 1.8674
Between lab variance S2L = 4.59182
Reproducibility var. S2R = 5.03662
Reproducibility std. SR = 2.24424 --> 4.20% R = 6.2839

Remarks: 3 Labs rejected! (13L,19L,23L)



Sample: **Sludge 2**
Element: **LOI**



Unit: mg/kg

Mandel's k statistics (Sludge 2 - LOI)
Mandel's h statistics (Sludge 2 - LOI)
Sludge 2 - LOI -- Mean PARM = 45.37 [mg/kg]


General calc.parm.
T1= 3.04206E+03
T2= 1.38138E+05
T3= 67
T4= 605
T5= 1.5100E+01
n= variabel
p= 9
N-table= 7

Mandel's statistics										End Result:						
LAB	PARM-gem	Stdev	N	h-mark	h	k	k-mark 1vX > AvST+2std	AvX < AvST-2std	PARM	Stdev	Rej.labs	N	N-1	dev_mean		
13L	31.1750	0.643	2	!!	-2.85	0.15			-	-	,13L	-	-	-14.20		
19L	37.9533	16.185	6		-1.39	3.66	!!	Fail	-	-	,19L	-	-	-7.42		
34L	44.2541	1.045	6		-0.04	0.24			44.2541	1.0452		6	5	-1.12		
26L	45.0092	0.810	12		0.12	0.18			45.0092	0.8104		12	11	-0.36		
7L	45.0900	0.326	6		0.14	0.07			45.0900	0.3265		6	5	-0.28		
45L	45.3167	0.349	6		0.19	0.08			45.3167	0.3498		6	5	-0.05		
31L	45.4800	0.259	5		0.23	0.06			45.4800	0.2588		5	4	0.11		
4L	45.5140	0.230	6		0.23	0.05			45.5140	0.2303		6	5	0.14		
1L	45.8500	0.212	2		0.31	0.05			45.8500	0.2121		2	1	0.48		
40L	45.9000	0.085	12		0.32	0.02			45.9000	0.0853		12	11	0.53		
55L	45.9167	0.237	12		0.32	0.05			45.9167	0.2368		12	11	0.55		
43L	46.3364	2.766	11		0.41	0.63			-	-	,43L	-	-	0.97		
65L	47.4763	0.952	8		0.65	0.22			-	-	,65L	-	-	2.11		
44L	50.7697	0.369	6		1.36	0.08			-	-	,44L	-	-	5.40		
Tot.gem	44.432	1.748 mg/kg		1%-level:	2.30	(1.63)			9	45.3701	(13L,19L,43L,44L,65L)	9	8			
Tot.std=	4.649	4.211		5%-level:	1.85	(1.43)			5							


100

RESULTS: Mean = 45.37007 mg/kg

Repeatability variance S2r = 0.26034
Repeatability std. Sr = 0.51023 --> 1.12% r = 1.4287
Between lab variance S2L = 0.25814
Reproducibility var. S2R = 0.51848
Reproducibility std. SR = 0.72005 --> 1.59% R = 2.0162
Remarks: 5 Labs rejected! (13L,19L,43L,44L,65L)



Sample: Soil 4
Element: LOI



Unit: mg/kg

Mandel's k statistics (Soil 4 - LOI)
Mandel's h statistics (Soil 4 - LOI)
Soil 4 - LOI -- Mean PARM = 4.84 [mg/kg]

General calc.parm.
T1= 4.16762E+02
T2= 2.02430E+03
T3= 86
T4= 722
T5= 8.2380E-01
n= variabel
p= 12
N-table= 7


		Mandel's statistics				End Result:								
LAB	PARM-gem	Stdev	N	h-mark	h	k	k-mark $\sqrt{vX} > AvST+2std$	$AvX < AvST-2std$	PARM	Stdev	Rej.labs	N	N-1	dev_mean
40L	4.5083	0.051	12		-0.65	0.04			4.5083	0.0515		12	11	-0.33
31L	4.5283	0.164	6		-0.64	0.14			4.5283	0.1642		6	5	-0.31
19L	4.7467	0.176	6		-0.51	0.15			4.7467	0.1759		6	5	-0.09
45L	4.7500	0.138	6		-0.50	0.11			4.7500	0.1378		6	5	-0.09
23L	4.8167	0.160	6		-0.46	0.13			4.8167	0.1602		6	5	-0.02
	4.8225	0.056	4		-0.46	0.05			4.8225	0.0556		4	3	-0.01
30L	4.8225	0.056	4		-0.46	0.05			4.8225	0.0556		4	3	-0.01
4L	4.8769	0.044	6		-0.43	0.04			4.8769	0.0439		6	5	0.04
26L	4.8800	0.107	12		-0.43	0.09			4.8800	0.1074		12	11	0.04
43L	4.8857	0.069	7		-0.42	0.06			4.8857	0.0690		7	6	0.05
1L	4.9000	0.100	3		-0.41	0.08			4.9000	0.1000		3	2	0.06
34L	5.0334	0.078	6		-0.33	0.06			5.0334	0.0781		6	5	0.20
7L	5.0967	0.255	6		-0.30	0.21			-	-	.7L	-	-	0.26
55L	5.2833	0.072	12		-0.18	0.06			5.2833	0.0718		12	11	0.45
13L	7.1850	4.815	2		0.96	3.98	II	Fail	-	-	.13L	-	-	2.35
65L	9.4917	0.041	6	II	2.34	0.03		Fail	-	-	.65L	-	-	4.66
44L	9.6276	0.040	6	II	2.42	0.03		Fail	-	-	.44L	-	-	4.79
Tot.gem		5.590	0.398 mg/kg		1%-level:	2.33 (1.63)			12	4.8360	(13L ,44L ,65L,7L)	12	11	
Tot.std=		1.665	1.180		5%-level:	1.86 (1.43)			4					

106


RESULTS: Mean = 4.83599 mg/kg

Repeatability variance S2r = 0.01113
Repeatability std. Sr = 0.10551 --> 2.18% r = 0.2954
Between lab variance S2L = 0.05822
Reproducibility var. S2R = 0.06936
Reproducibility std. SR = 0.26336 --> 5.45% R = 0.7374

Remarks: 4 Labs rejected! (13L ,44L ,65L,7L)



Sample: Soil 5
Element: LOI



Unit: mg/kg

Mandel's k statistics (Soil 5 - LOI)
Mandel's h statistics (Soil 5 - LOI)
Soil 5 - LOI -- Mean PARM = 4.99 [mg/kg]

General calc.parm.
T1= 4.04880E+02
T2= 2.02592E+03
T3= 81
T4= 719
T5= 1.5929E+00
n= variabel
p= 11
N-table= 7


Mandel's statistics										End Result:									
LAB	PARM-gem	Stdev	N	h-mark	h	k	k-mark 1vX > AvST+2std	AvX < AvST-2std	PARM	Stdev	Rej.labs	N	N-1	dev_mean					
13L	4.3300	1.881	2		-1.50	3.08	!!							-0.66					
1L	4.7500	0.071	2		-0.75	0.12			4.7500	0.0707		2	1	-0.24					
40L	4.7583	0.067	12		-0.74	0.11			4.7583	0.0669		12	11	-0.23					
26L	4.9000	0.264	12		-0.49	0.43			4.9000	0.2642		12	11	-0.09					
23L	4.9600	0.114	5		-0.38	0.19			4.9600	0.1140		5	4	-0.03					
4L	4.9883	0.086	6		-0.33	0.14			4.9883	0.0860		6	5	0.00					
31L	4.9900	0.048	5		-0.33	0.08			4.9900	0.0485		5	4	0.00					
43L	5.0100	0.099	10		-0.29	0.16			5.0100	0.0994		10	9	0.02					
19L	5.0400	0.083	5		-0.24	0.14			5.0400	0.0834		5	4	0.05					
45L	5.0500	0.084	6		-0.22	0.14			5.0500	0.0837		6	5	0.06					
7L	5.1000	0.283	6		-0.13	0.46			5.1000	0.2831		6	5	0.11					
55L	5.3000	0.104	12		0.23	0.17			5.3000	0.1044		12	11	0.31					
34L	5.6978	1.212	6		0.94	1.98	!!							0.71					
44L	6.3408	0.164	6	I	2.08	0.27	Fail							1.35					
65L	6.3740	0.595	10	I	2.14	0.97	Fail							1.39					
Tot.gem	5.173	0.344 mg/kg			2.32	(1.63)		11	4.9861			11	10						
Tot.std=	0.561	0.523			1.86	(1.43)		4											

105

RESULTS: Mean = 4.98606 mg/kg

Repeatability variance S2r = 0.02276
Repeatability std. Sr = 0.15085 --> 3.03% r = 0.4224
Between lab variance S2L = 0.02622
Reproducibility var. S2R = 0.04898
Reproducibility std. SR = 0.22132 --> 4.44% R = 0.6197

Remarks: 4 Labs rejected! (13L ,34L ,44L ,65L)



Annex 4:

Raw data submitted

	Sample: Compost 1		[% d.m.]		Sample: Compost 1		[% d.m.]
	Element:	LOI			Element:	LOI	
	LAB	PARM			LAB	PARM	
	1L	45.60			45L	46.40	
	1L	45.20			45L	45.20	
	1L	44.90			45L	44.80	
1st ign.	26L	44.67			45L	44.40	
1st ign.	26L	44.73			45L	43.50	
1st ign.	26L	45.00			45L	42.80	
1st ign.	26L	43.74			4L	45.35	
1st ign.	26L	45.01			4L	45.04	
1st ign.	26L	45.09			4L	44.65	
2nd ign.	26L	44.64			4L	44.31	
2nd ign.	26L	45.03			4L	44.19	
2nd ign.	26L	45.27			4L	43.86	
2nd ign.	26L	43.81			55L	46.30	
2nd ign.	26L	45.14			55L	46.30	
2nd ign.	26L	45.19			55L	46.10	
	30L	46.10			55L	46.10	
	30L	45.70			55L	45.70	
	30L	44.30			55L	45.70	
	30L	44.20			55L	45.50	
	31L	44.70			55L	45.50	
	31L	44.40			55L	45.40	
	31L	44.20			55L	45.40	
	31L	44.10			55L	45.40	
	31L	44.00			55L	45.40	
	31L	44.00		1st ign.	65L	43.79	
	34L	43.46		1st ign.	65L	44.87	
	34L	40.95		1st ign.	65L	41.27	
	34L	40.85		1st ign.	65L	42.20	
	34L	39.85		2nd ign.	65L	47.10	
	34L	38.86		2nd ign.	65L	48.30	
	34L	37.62		2nd ign.	65L	44.33	
1st ign.	40L	44.00		2nd ign.	65L	45.34	
1st ign.	40L	44.40			7L	45.92	
1st ign.	40L	44.50			7L	45.48	
1st ign.	40L	44.50			7L	45.31	
1st ign.	40L	44.40			7L	45.26	
1st ign.	40L	44.30			7L	45.06	
2nd ign.	40L	44.20			7L	44.94	
2nd ign.	40L	44.50			23L	44.30	
2nd ign.	40L	44.60			23L	45.80	
2nd ign.	40L	44.70			23L	46.10	
2nd ign.	40L	44.50			23L	45.80	
2nd ign.	40L	44.30			23L	44.90	
1st ign.	43L	42.70			23L	44.60	
1st ign.	43L	43.00					
1st ign.	43L	43.30					
1st ign.	43L	43.00					
1st ign.	43L	43.70					
1st ign.	43L	44.00					
2nd ign.	43L	44.20					
2nd ign.	43L	44.50					
2nd ign.	43L	45.40					
2nd ign.	43L	44.90					
2nd ign.	43L	45.40					
2nd ign.	44L	54.33					
	44L	53.66					
	44L	53.16					
	44L	52.26					
	44L	52.20					
	44L	50.95					

	Sample: Compost 2		[% d.m.]		Sample: Compost 2		[% d.m.]
	Element:	LOI			Element:	LOI	
	LAB	PARM			LAB	PARM	
	19L	29.50			45L	29.80	
	19L	28.99			45L	29.20	
	19L	28.93			45L	28.60	
	19L	27.58			45L	28.60	
	19L	25.25			45L	27.10	
	19L	24.59			45L	27.00	
	1L	29.50			4L	30.16	
	1L	29.00			4L	30.11	
	1L	26.50			4L	29.62	
1st ign.	26L	27.09			4L	29.36	
1st ign.	26L	28.59			4L	28.39	
1st ign.	26L	29.12			4L	27.70	
1st ign.	26L	27.48			55L	30.30	
1st ign.	26L	29.06			55L	30.30	
1st ign.	26L	29.62			55L	29.80	
2nd ign.	26L	27.29			55L	29.80	
2nd ign.	26L	28.77			55L	29.70	
2nd ign.	26L	29.15			55L	29.70	
2nd ign.	26L	27.52			55L	28.70	
2nd ign.	26L	28.93			55L	28.70	
2nd ign.	26L	29.73			55L	28.20	
	31L	30.00			55L	28.20	
	31L	29.40			55L	27.10	
	31L	29.10			55L	27.10	
	31L	28.70		1st ign.	65L	33.12	
	31L	28.60		1st ign.	65L	34.07	
	31L	27.00		1st ign.	65L	32.92	
	34L	28.25		1st ign.	65L	34.93	
	34L	27.62		2nd ign.	65L	33.66	
	34L	26.98		2nd ign.	65L	34.15	
	34L	26.11		2nd ign.	65L	33.15	
	34L	25.97		2nd ign.	65L	35.59	
	34L	25.93			7L	30.61	
1st ign.	40L	25.10			7L	30.04	
1st ign.	40L	25.20			7L	29.95	
1st ign.	40L	24.90			7L	29.35	
1st ign.	40L	25.00			7L	29.00	
1st ign.	40L	24.90			7L	28.37	
1st ign.	40L	24.90			23L	29.10	
2nd ign.	40L	25.10			23L	29.20	
2nd ign.	40L	25.40			23L	27.10	
2nd ign.	40L	24.90			23L	27.40	
2nd ign.	40L	25.00			23L	27.40	
2nd ign.	40L	25.00					
2nd ign.	40L	25.10					
1st ign.	43L	24.80					
1st ign.	43L	25.40					
1st ign.	43L	26.50					
1st ign.	43L	25.70					
1st ign.	43L	26.10					
1st ign.	43L	26.80					
2nd ign.	43L	25.00					
2nd ign.	43L	25.80					
2nd ign.	43L	26.90					
2nd ign.	43L	26.30					
2nd ign.	43L	26.40					
2nd ign.	43L	27.20					
	44L	40.11					
	44L	38.22					
	44L	37.52					
	44L	37.37					
	44L	36.51					
	44L	35.93					

	Sample:	Waste Sludge 1	[% d.m.]	
	Element:	LOI		
	LAB	PARM		
	13L	40.3		
	13L	40.2		
	19L	55.5		
	19L	53.3		
	19L	53.2		
	19L	53.1		
	19L	52.8		
	19L	44.9		
	1L	54.2		
	1L	54.0		
	1L	53.8		
	1st ign.	26L	53.00	
	1st ign.	26L	53.19	
	1st ign.	26L	54.05	
	1st ign.	26L	52.85	
	1st ign.	26L	53.01	
	1st ign.	26L	53.61	
	2nd ign.	26L	53.38	
	2nd ign.	26L	53.87	
	2nd ign.	26L	53.98	
2nd ign.	26L	53.21		
2nd ign.	26L	53.26		
2nd ign.	26L	53.61		
	31L	53.0		
	31L	52.8		
	31L	52.7		
	31L	52.7		
	31L	52.6		
	34L	49.9		
	34L	48.8		
	34L	47.5		
	34L	47.5		
	34L	47.2		
34L	47.1			
1st ign.	40L	25.10		
1st ign.	40L	25.20		
1st ign.	40L	24.90		
1st ign.	40L	25.00		
1st ign.	40L	24.90		
1st ign.	40L	24.90		
2nd ign.	40L	25.10		
2nd ign.	40L	25.40		
2nd ign.	40L	24.90		
2nd ign.	40L	25.00		
2nd ign.	40L	25.00		
2nd ign.	40L	25.10		
1st ign.	43L	24.80		
1st ign.	43L	25.40		
1st ign.	43L	26.50		
1st ign.	43L	25.70		
1st ign.	43L	26.10		
1st ign.	43L	26.80		
2nd ign.	43L	25.00		
2nd ign.	43L	25.80		
2nd ign.	43L	26.90		
2nd ign.	43L	26.30		
2nd ign.	43L	26.40		
2nd ign.	44L	27.20		
	44L	59.8		
	44L	59.7		
	44L	58.2		
	44L	58.1		
	44L	58.0		

	Sample: Element:	Sewage Sludge 1 LOI	[% d.m.]
	LAB	PARM	
	45L	54.4	
	45L	54.1	
	45L	53.5	
	45L	53.4	
	45L	53.4	
	45L	53.4	
	4L	53.5	
	4L	53.4	
	4L	53.3	
	4L	53.3	
	4L	53.3	
	4L	53.3	
	55L	54.4	
	55L	54.4	
	55L	54.2	
	55L	54.2	
	55L	54.2	
	55L	54.2	
	55L	54.2	
	55L	54.2	
	55L	54.2	
	55L	54.0	
	55L	54.0	
1st ign.	65L	50.10	
1st ign.	65L	51.83	
1st ign.	65L	49.89	
1st ign.	65L	50.29	
2nd ign.	65L	52.92	
2nd ign.	65L	54.38	
2nd ign.	65L	52.68	
2nd ign.	65L	53.04	
	7L	53.7	
	7L	53.6	
	7L	53.4	
	7L	53.4	
	7L	53.3	
	7L	53.2	
	23L	57.3	
	23L	46.3	
	23L		
	23L		
	23L		
	23L		

	Sample: Sewage Sludge 2		[% d.m.]		Sample: Sewage Sludge 2		[% d.m.]
	Element:	LOI			Element:	LOI	
	LAB	PARM			LAB	PARM	
	13L	31.6			45L	45.7	
	13L	30.7			45L	45.5	
	19L	44.9			45L	45.5	
	19L	44.8			45L	45.3	
	19L	44.6			45L	45.2	
	19L	44.3			45L	44.7	
	19L	44.2			4L	45.9	
	19L	4.9			4L	45.5	
	1L	46.0			4L	45.5	
	1L	45.7			4L	45.4	
1st ign.	26L	45.22			4L	45.3	
1st ign.	26L	45.64			4L	45.3	
1st ign.	26L	45.83			55L	46.2	
1st ign.	26L	43.58			55L	46.2	
1st ign.	26L	44.49			55L	46.1	
1st ign.	26L	44.69			55L	46.1	
2nd ign.	26L	45.42			55L	46.0	
2nd ign.	26L	45.66			55L	46.0	
2nd ign.	26L	45.94			55L	45.9	
2nd ign.	26L	43.58			55L	45.9	
2nd ign.	26L	44.72			55L	45.8	
2nd ign.	26L	45.34			55L	45.8	
	31L	45.8			55L	45.5	
	31L	45.6			55L	45.5	
	31L	45.5		1st ign.	65L	45.88	
	31L	45.4		1st ign.	65L	46.40	
	31L	45.1		1st ign.	65L	46.85	
	34L	46.1		1st ign.	65L	48.21	
	34L	44.5		2nd ign.	65L	47.99	
	34L	44.4		2nd ign.	65L	48.02	
	34L	43.6		2nd ign.	65L	48.18	
	34L	43.6		2nd ign.	65L	48.28	
	34L	43.3			7L	45.5	
1st ign.	40L	45.80			7L	45.3	
1st ign.	40L	45.90			7L	45.2	
1st ign.	40L	45.80			7L	44.9	
1st ign.	40L	45.90			7L	44.8	
1st ign.	40L	45.80			7L	44.7	
1st ign.	40L	45.90			23L	46.0	
2nd ign.	40L	46.00			23L	46.6	
2nd ign.	40L	46.00			23L	46.5	
2nd ign.	40L	45.80			23L	46.8	
2nd ign.	40L	46.00			23L	45.1	
2nd ign.	40L	45.90					
2nd ign.	40L	46.00					
1st ign.	43L	45.80					
1st ign.	43L	45.90					
1st ign.	43L	44.90					
1st ign.	43L	45.20					
1st ign.	43L	45.50					
1st ign.	43L	54.60					
2nd ign.	43L	45.90					
2nd ign.	43L	46.00					
2nd ign.	43L	45.00					
2nd ign.	43L	45.30					
2nd ign.	43L	45.60					
	44L	51.2					
	44L	51.1					
	44L	50.9					
	44L	50.6					
	44L	50.5					
	44L	50.3					

	Sample: Element:	Soil 4 LOI	[% d.m.]	Sample: Element:	Soil 4 LOI	[% d.m.]
	LAB	PARM		LAB	PARM	
	13L	10.6		45L	4.9	
	13L	3.8		45L	4.9	
	19L	5.1		45L	4.8	
	19L	4.8		45L	4.7	
	19L	4.8		45L	4.6	
	19L	4.7		45L	4.6	
	19L	4.6		4L	5.0	
	19L	4.6		4L	4.9	
	1L	5.0		4L	4.9	
	1L	4.9		4L	4.9	
	1L	4.8		4L	4.9	
1st ign.	26L	4.82		4L	4.8	
1st ign.	26L	4.94		55L	5.4	
1st ign.	26L	4.97		55L	5.4	
1st ign.	26L	4.72		55L	5.3	
1st ign.	26L	4.77		55L	5.3	
1st ign.	26L	4.99		55L	5.3	
2nd ign.	26L	4.93		55L	5.3	
2nd ign.	26L	4.94		55L	5.3	
2nd ign.	26L	4.96		55L	5.3	
2nd ign.	26L	4.73		55L	5.2	
2nd ign.	26L	4.78		55L	5.2	
2nd ign.	26L	5.01		55L	5.2	
	30L	4.9		55L	5.2	
	30L	4.9	1st ign.	65L	9.51	
	30L	4.8	1st ign.	65L	9.44	
	30L	4.8	2nd ign.	65L	9.51	
	31L	4.7	2nd ign.	65L	9.55	
	31L	4.6	2nd ign.	65L	9.45	
	31L	4.6	2nd ign.	65L	9.49	
	31L	4.5		7L	5.4	
	31L	4.5		7L	5.3	
	31L	4.3		7L	5.2	
	34L	5.1		7L	4.9	
	34L	5.1		7L	4.9	
	34L	5.1		7L	4.8	
	34L	5.0		23L	4.9	
	34L	5.0		23L	4.5	
	34L	4.9		23L	4.9	
1st ign.	40L	4.50		23L	4.9	
1st ign.	40L	4.50		23L	4.9	
1st ign.	40L	4.50		23L	4.9	
1st ign.	40L	4.50				
1st ign.	40L	4.40				
1st ign.	40L	4.50				
2nd ign.	40L	4.50				
2nd ign.	40L	4.50				
2nd ign.	40L	4.50				
2nd ign.	40L	4.60				
2nd ign.	40L	4.50				
2nd ign.	40L	4.60				
1st ign.	43L	4.90				
1st ign.	43L	4.80				
1st ign.	43L	4.90				
2nd ign.	43L	4.90				
2nd ign.	43L	5.00				
2nd ign.	43L	4.80				
2nd ign.	43L	4.90				
	44L	9.7				
	44L	9.7				
	44L	9.6				
	44L	9.6				
	44L	9.6				
	44L	9.6				

	Sample: Element:	Soil 5 LOI	[% d.m.]
	LAB	PARM	
	13L	5.7	
	13L	3.0	
	19L	5.2	
	19L	5.0	
	19L	5.0	
	19L	5.0	
	19L	5.0	
	1L	4.8	
	1L	4.7	
1st ign.	26L	4.25	
1st ign.	26L	4.84	
1st ign.	26L	4.92	
1st ign.	26L	4.94	
1st ign.	26L	5.04	
1st ign.	26L	5.18	
2nd ign.	26L	4.65	
2nd ign.	26L	4.82	
2nd ign.	26L	4.97	
2nd ign.	26L	4.90	
2nd ign.	26L	4.99	
2nd ign.	26L	5.30	
	31L	5.1	
	31L	5.0	
	31L	5.0	
	31L	5.0	
	31L	5.0	
	34L	8.2	
	34L	5.2	
	34L	5.2	
	34L	5.2	
	34L	5.2	
	34L	5.1	
1st ign.	40L	4.80	
1st ign.	40L	4.70	
1st ign.	40L	4.70	
1st ign.	40L	4.80	
1st ign.	40L	4.70	
1st ign.	40L	4.80	
2nd ign.	40L	4.80	
2nd ign.	40L	4.60	
2nd ign.	40L	4.80	
2nd ign.	40L	4.80	
2nd ign.	40L	4.80	
2nd ign.	40L	4.80	
1st ign.	43L	4.90	
1st ign.	43L	5.00	
1st ign.	43L	5.10	
1st ign.	43L	4.90	
1st ign.	43L	5.00	
2nd ign.	43L	5.00	
2nd ign.	43L	5.10	
2nd ign.	43L	5.20	
2nd ign.	43L	4.90	
2nd ign.	43L	5.00	
	44L	6.6	
	44L	6.4	
	44L	6.3	
	44L	6.3	
	44L	6.3	
	44L	6.2	

	Sample: Element:	Soil 5 LOI	[% d.m.]
	LAB	PARM	
	45L	5.1	
	45L	5.1	
	45L	5.1	
	45L	5.1	
	45L	5.0	
	45L	4.9	
	4L	5.1	
	4L	5.1	
	4L	5.0	
	4L	5.0	
	4L	4.9	
	4L	4.9	
	55L	5.5	
	55L	5.5	
	55L	5.3	
	55L	5.3	
	55L	5.3	
	55L	5.3	
	55L	5.3	
	55L	5.2	
	55L	5.2	
	55L	5.2	
	55L	5.2	
1st ign.	65L	6.57	
1st ign.	65L	6.58	
1st ign.	65L	6.66	
1st ign.	65L	6.77	
2nd ign.	65L	6.58	
2nd ign.	65L	6.59	
2nd ign.	65L	6.68	
2nd ign.	65L	6.79	
	7L	5.3	
	7L	5.3	
	7L	5.2	
	7L	5.2	
	7L	5.1	
	7L	4.5	
	23L	5.0	
	23L	5.1	
	23L	4.9	
	23L	4.8	
	23L	5.0	

European Commission

EUR 23011 EN– Joint Research Centre – Institute for Environment and Sustainability

Title: Project HORIZONTAL Validation Report on loss on ignition

Author(s): E. Sobiecka, H. van der Sloot, K. Andersen, B. M. Gawlik

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

2007 – 54 pp. – 21.0 x 29.7 cm

EUR – Scientific and Technical Research series – ISSN 1018-5593

ISBN 978-92-79-07411-0

Abstract

Project HORIZONTAL is interdisciplinary aiming at a harmonisation and horizontal standardisation of test procedures, in particular for sludge, soils and biowastes. In the context of this standardization project, a series of draft technical specification were designed upon an extensive desk study, fine-tuned after expert consultations and finally validated in international intercomparisons exercise.

This report summarises the work performed within the validation study of the draft standard for the determination of loss on ignition (LOI) in soils, sludge and treated bio-waste. It further explains the underlying statistical concept for the calculation of reproducibility and repeatability from intercomparisons data. In addition all single values, results of the statistical evaluation as well as background information on the validation materials used are described and explained.

The mission of the JRC is to provide customer-driven scientific and technical support for the conception, development, implementation and monitoring of EU policies. As a service of the European Commission, the JRC functions as a reference centre of science and technology for the Union. Close to the policy-making process, it serves the common interest of the Member States, while being independent of special interests, whether private or national.

